

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated June 9, 2005, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

By this Amendment, claims 6 and 11 have been amended. Support for the amendments to claim 6 can be found on page 5, lines 1-10 and on page 8, lines 13-18 of the specification, and in Figs. 1 and 2 as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Claims 6-10 are pending and respectfully submitted for consideration.

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indicating allowable subject matter in claims 6-11. The Applicants submit that in view of the amendments discussed herein, the application is in condition for allowance.

The Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed September 11, 2003, was objected to as not including a legible copy of the foreign patents. The Applicants note that a new IDS was inadvertently omitted from the response to the previous Office Action. The Applicants submit herewith a new IDS, including a legible copy of the foreign references that were not considered by the Examiner in the IDS filed September 11, 2003. These foreign references were identified as Japanese Patent Publications Nos. 2-144191 and 1235042.

The Abstract was objected to for minor informalities. The Applicants note that a substitute Abstract was inadvertently omitted from the response to the previous Office Action. The Applicants submit herewith a substitute Abstract responsive to the objection.


Claims 6-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office Action took the position that it was unclear what encompasses the total weight(s) of the sub-frame and main frame. See page 3, lines 1-2 of the Office Action. In addition, the Office Action took the position that claim 6, as previously amended, did not identify what specific mounted members are on each frame member. See page 3, paragraph 7C of the Office Action. Responsive to the rejection, the Applicants have amended claim 6 to include the specific mounted members on the main frame. The mounted members are disclosed at least on page 5, lines 1-10, and in Figs. 1 and 2 of the Specification as originally filed. The Applicants further amended claim 6 to remove the limitation of the sub-frame "including mounted members" to correspond with the feature of the sub-frame shown in Figs. 1 and 2. As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6, as amended, clearly recites the total mass of the sub-frame with respect to the main frame.

Claims 7-11 depend from claim 6. The Applicants respectfully submit that these dependent claims are allowable at least because of their dependency from allowable base claim 6. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections and rejections, allowance of claims 6-11, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing Attorney Dkt. No. 107156-00205.**

Respectfully submitted,



George E. Oram, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 27,931

**Customer No. 004372**  
ARENT FOX PLLC  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339  
Tel: (202) 857-6000  
Fax: (202) 638-4810

GEO/RLB/elz/vdb

Enclosures: Substitute Abstract  
Information Disclosure Statement  
(w/ Japanese Patent Publications Nos. 2-144191 and 1235042)

TECH/327317.1